(SRI KADIDAL MANJAPPA.)
record the tyrannical rule of Congress. I am glad to say that histroy will record the glorious rule of the Congress.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Leaving behind Vidhana Soudha.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—Even if Sri Srinivasa Iyengar becomes the Chief Minister or Sri Gopala Gowda becomes the Chief Minister, they cannot prevent shooting or lathi charge or some ugly incidents here and there. It is all easy to say anything that pleases us when we are not having any responsibility. An organisation or a party which has not shouldered any responsibility can easily make comments of any kind. But when the same party comes to power then it will realise that it is not as easy as speaking or making comments.

I have nothing to add. This is a non-controversial resolution. I commed this for the approval of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is.

"That this House ratifies the amendments proposed to be made to the Constitution of India by the Constitution (Seventh Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the two Houses of Parliament."

The motion was adopted.

MYSORE KHADI AND VILLAGE INDUSTRIES BILL, 1956.

Select Committee report presented.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, the House will remember that it referred the Khadi and Village Industries Bill. to the Select Committee with a direction to give its report to day. I am laying the report on the Table. Hon'ble members will get copies of the report in course of the day.

MYSORE ESSENTIAL SERVICES MAINTENANCE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now we will take up the Essential Services Bill for consideration.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, yesterday alone I said that I want to carry the House with me with regard to the reasonableness and utility of the Bill and get it passed. Though we all represent the interest of the labour, there are persons who are directly interested in that question. I have already submitted that more than 50 per cent have agreed with the reasonableness and utility of the measures. I also want to carry with me others. Therefore, I submit, further discussion on this may be taken up later.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have no objection.

THE MYSORE LEGISLATURE (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) BILL, 1956.

Motion to consider

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—I move:

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration."

Sir, this House is aware that till very recently the Life Insurance business was mostly carried on by private companies. A few States like Mysore also had a department of Insurance, but the bulk of business in the whole of India was in non-Governmental hands. But in 1956 an emergency Ordinance was passed nationalising Insurance business. Subsequently, it was enacted into law also. It is learnt that the business will come under a Corporation. But we are an are interval between the time that they belonged to non-Governmental business and the time that they would go to the Corporation. Now, according to the enactment most of the workers in the insurance line will become Government servants and their offices will become offices of profit. There are a large number of representatives from that business in the Legislature. In the Act, section 15 provides for exempting those who are

engaged in insurance business from becoming disqualified on that reason. The enactment was passed and the Government of India have sent a letter to this Government pointing to us the desirability of removing disqualification in respect of those members who are already sitting members. There is also another aspect of the matter, namely, we are going to have general elections shortly and those who are engaged in insurance business would be deprived of the opportunity of contesting the election. Therefore, in order to remove the disqualification this Bill has been brought before this House. I submit that this is a very important and useful measure and request that this may be taken into consideration.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡ (ತುರುವೇಕೆರೆ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಇಂಥಾ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳಿಗೇನೇ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಪ್ರಾಶಸ್ತ್ಯ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ತಪ್ಪದಂತೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಇವರ ಪಾಲಸಿ ತಮಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಸಿಂಧುವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕೆಂದು ಇದೆ. ಇವರು ದೇಶದ ಹಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಗಮನಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಹುಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಟೆನೆಸಿ ಬಿಲ್‌ಮತ್ತು ಯೂನಿವರ್ಸಿಟಿ ಬಿಲ್ ಇಂಥವುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ "ನಾವು ಆತುರರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ" ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದರಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಾರೇ ಶಿವಾಯ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಆ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಮನಸ್ಸಿದ್ದಹಾಗೆ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲ ಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹೀಗೆ 3-4 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ಹಿಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಿದ್ದು ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ತೀವ್ರ ಆಭಿಲಾಷೆ ಇದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೇನೆಂದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪೈಕಿ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಥಾನ ಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ; ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಇವರಿಗೊಂದು ಇಂಥ ತ್ವರಿತ ಆವಶ್ಯಕತೆ ಉಂಟಾಗಿರಬಹುದು. ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಇವರು ಹೀಗೆ ಆತುರಾತುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತರುತ್ತಲೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹೋಗಲಿ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ತಾವು ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಜನರಿಗೆ ಲಭಿಸುವ ಹಾಗಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೇ ಇರಬಹುದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗರುಗಳು ಕೇವಲ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 4-5ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ನಂಬಳಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ದುಡಿಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಶ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ತಕ್ಕಷ್ಟುಪ್ರತಿ ಫಲವನ್ನು ನೀವು ಬೇರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಯಾವ ರೂಪವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಕಷ್ಟದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇವೆನಲ್ಲಿರುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜನರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಕನಿಕರವಿಲ್ಲದ ಮೇಲೆ, ನೀವು ಈ ಇನ್ಷೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಗೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರಿ? ಅಂಥ ಕಡಮೆ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಯಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೆ ಇದು ಅನ್ಯಾಯವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತಕ್ಕ ಇನ್ಷೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೋಲ್ಡರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಏಕೆ ಅನ್ಯಾಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಇದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ನೀತಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದರ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಸಾವಿರ-ಎರಡು ಸಾವಿರ ಹೀಗೆ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವವರಿಗೆ ಇಂಥ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ತುಂಬಾ ಶೋಚನೀಯ! ದೇಶಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶ ನೀಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಇರಾವೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಇರುವುದಾದರೆ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 5-10 ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನರಿಗೆ ತಾವು ಮೊದಲು ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಿ. ಆದರೆ ನಾನೀಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವರಲ್ಲಿ ಖಾಯಂ ನೌಕರರಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಪೆರ್ಮನೆಂಟ್ ಪಡೆಯುವ ನೌಕರಿಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಅನುಕೂಲಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಯಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದ ಸ್ಥಳ ವಿದ್ಯಮಾನಗಳ ಅನುಭವ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಪಡೆದಿದ್ದಾರೋ ಅಂಥ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ನೀಡಲು ತಮಗೇನು ತೊಂದರೆಯಿದೆ? ಇವರಿಗೇಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು? ಈ ಹಿಂದೆ ನೀವೇ ಇಂಥ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಯುಳ್ಳವರಿಗೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾಗಲು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಕೂಡದೆಂದು ವಾದಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗ ನೀವೇ ಹಿಂದೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿ ಈಗೇಕೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ತಮ್ಮ ಪೈಕಿ ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಸ್ಥಾನಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಆ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಮಾಡಲು ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂಬುದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ನೀವು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಗುಂಪಿನ ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ನಾವು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಖಂಡಿತ ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಲೈಫ್ ಇನ್ಷೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿಯವರ ವಿಚಾರ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಆ ಫೈರ್ ಮತ್ತು ಮೋಟಾರ್ ಇನ್ಷೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ನಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ನಂಬಂಧೀಕರಿದ್ದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಹೀಗೆ ಇದೇ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಪುನಃ ಪುನಃ ಇಂಥ ಬಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ತರಲು ಈಗಿನಿಂದಲೇ ದಾರಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ಯಾಯ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪ್ರಜೆ ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲಿ ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ಒಂದು ನಂಬಳ ಅಥವಾ ಪೆರ್ಷನ್ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥವರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಉಳಿದ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮಾನವಾದ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಉಚಿತ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದಿದ್ದರೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಭಾರಿ ಧಕ್ಕೆಯುಂಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾನಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ (ಟಿ. ನರಸೀಪುರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ; ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರವರು ವಿರೋಧಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ನಾನೂ ಸಹ ವಿರೋಧಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಇನ್ಷೂರೆನ್ಸ್ ಬಿಜಿನೆನ್ಸನ್ನು ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಖಾಸಗೀ ಜನರೇ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಆಗ ಆ ಏಜಂಟರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕಂಪೆನಿಯವರು ಅವರು ನಡೆಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಿಜಿನೆನ್ಸಿಗೆ ತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಅಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್)

ಹೀಗೆ ಕಮಿಷನ್ ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿದ್ದಂಥ ಯಾರಾದರೊಬ್ಬ ಮನುಷ್ಯ-ಅಂದರೆ ಏಜಿಂಟರು ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದು ಆಗ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಇವರು ಲಾಭ ಸಂಪಾದನೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಪಂಗಡಕ್ಕೆ ಸೇರಿದ ಜನ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಭಾವಿಸಿ ಆತನಿಗೆ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭಾ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರೆ, ಆಗ ಇವರು ಇಂಥ ಮನೂ ದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವೇನೂ ಇರುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭವೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ ಈ ಮನೂದೆಯ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಕೇವಲ ಆ ಏಜೆಂಟರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸದೆ ಇದರ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಆ ಕಂಪೆನಿಗಳ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರುಗಳಿಗೂ-ಬ್ಯಾಂಚ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಮತ್ತು ಸಬ್ ಮ್ಯಾನೇಜರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವ ಅರ್ಥದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ನೌಕರರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಈ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು? ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಶ್ರೀ ಹುಚ್ಚೇಗೌಡರು ಆ ಪಟೇಲ್ ಶ್ಯಾನುಭೋಗರ ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಬಹಳ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಕೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವನ್ನು ಆ ಪಟೇಲ್, ಶಾನುಭೋಗರುಗಳಿಗೂ ಏಕೆ ಕೊಡಬಾರದು? ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ವಿಚಾರಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿವರಣೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I sympathise with the category of public servants who come under Shanbhogues and Patels. I concede that they receive small remuneration and they have got to supplement their income by other means also. Their duty is not merely to collect revenues, though the salary or commission is very small, but they have other statutory duties also to perform. Till recently the insurance business was in private hands. Now, excepting a few officers at the top, the bulk of them have been absorbed. I have also pointed out that they are going into the Corporation separating itself from the Government business. Because they suddenly cease to be members and cease to be Government servants also, after an entervals to protect their interest this measure is brought forward. A membership in the Legislature is very important. It has the power of controlling the executive Government, forming Cabinet or Council of Ministers or the Government itself. Therefore a subordinate of that Government should not be in a position to control that very Government. That is the principle involved. Therefore, whenever there is a Government servant who is in a subordinate position, he cannot become the master as well. Therefore the conditions of this class of servants require a good deal of reform and I hope with the integration which is coming up, a speedy reform will be expedited and necessary relief will be given to this class of employees also. The principle is that a subordinate shall not become the master also. As a measure of relief this section has been introduced in the enactment itself and I believe very wisely and out of necessity.

We have been advised by the Central Government to put forward for the consideration of this House the present amending Bill, in identical terms. Therefore, in order to protect the principle which underlies the membership of the House, there is necessity for removing the disqualification which is of a temporary nature.

I request the support of this Hous for this motion.

Sri P. R. RAMAIYA (Basavangudi).—Has such legislation been passed by the Parliament and also other legislatures?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I do not know about other States. I learn that the Andhra Legislature has passed such an amendment already.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is.—

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clauses. The question is:

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 1, Title and Preamble. The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill 1956, as passed by the Council, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is:—

"That the Mysore Legislature (Prevention of Disqualification) Bill. 1956, as passed by the Council, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE MYSORE HOUSE RENT AND ACCOMMODATION CONTROL (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1956.

Motion to Consider.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore House Rent and Accommodation Control (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council, be taken into consideration."

This is a very simple measure. The House Rent and Accommodation Control Act prescribes a period during which it will be in force. That period expires by the end of 1957 and particularly now the position of housing in urban areas has become bad and it is expected that with the integration of new areas, the rush for accommodation will be very great. Hence the necessity for continuing this enactment. The amendment seeks to continue the enactment for a further period of two years.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore House Rent and Accommodation Control (Amendment) Bill, 1956, as passed by the Legislative Council be taken into consideration."

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore South).—I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister whether he could furnish some information, whether any opinion has been taken from different Bar Associations in the State before asking us to extend the duration of this enactment up to the year 1959. It is better that the House is apprised of the information whether the Government has collected the necessary data to warrant the extension of this measure.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We have not yet collected the opinion of the Bar Associations. But we have the Governmental Agency who are bound to supply information to get the required information. Based on that information we are seeking for the extension of the life of this enactment by two years.

*Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—I too want to say something on this Bill, Sir. No doubt there may be a great demand for accommodation in Bangalore City in view of the States Reorganisation and the merging of other parts of the States. If they had sought to extend it from place to place, it was a different thing. Now because there is a little rush from other areas, would it be justifiable to extend the entire Act, which has an element of control throughout the State? It is always better that we remove controls as far as possible. Would it not be better for the Government to take power only so far as Mysore and Bangalore and other cities are concerned and leave the other areas from the purview of this legislation?

Sri M. PALANIYAPPAN (Ulsoor).—Sir, I want to ask how the House Rent Control is working in Bangalore. It was stated before that the intention was to have the House Rent and Accommodation Control measure only for two years. It is now being said that this measure may be extended by another two years. When the present Act was passed, it was done with very good motive and with the object of helping people to get houses easily and also to see that proper tenants are secured by the house-owners. What we see today happening in Bangalore and in other Cities where the Act is in force is that inordinate delay is taking place in allotting houses and when a house is to be vacated, the owner goes to the court seeking redress to turn